

REMARKS

This Application has been carefully reviewed in light of the Office Action mailed February 22, 2005. Claims 1-23 were pending in the Application. In the Office Action, Claims 1-23 were rejected. In order to expedite and advance the prosecution of the present Application, Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 8, 13, 16 and 21. Thus, Claims 1-23 remain pending in the Application. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and favorable action in this case.

In the Office Action, the following actions were taken or matters were raised:

SPECIFICATION OBJECTIONS

The Examiner objected to the title of the invention as not being descriptive. Applicant respectfully disagrees. The present invention as defined by the claims of the present Application is directed toward a method and system for automatically forwarding a request. For example, Claim 1 recites: "A method for automatically forwarding a request." Thus, Applicant respectfully submits that the title of the present Application is clearly indicative of the invention to which the claims are directed and, accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this objection be withdrawn.

SECTION 112 REJECTIONS

Claims 3, 13 and 21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter, which Applicant regards as the invention. Specifically, the Examiner states that the claims disclose a request comprising an implied mask but then inserting the implied mask into the request (Office Action, page 2). Applicant respectfully submits that Claims 3, 13 and 21 comply with the requirements of 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. However, in order to advance and expedite the prosecution of the present Application, Applicant has amended claims 3, 13 and 21 to better clarify the claimed invention. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that this rejection now be withdrawn.

SECTION 102 REJECTIONS

Claims 1, 2, 4-11, 14-17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,301,617 issued to Carr (hereinafter "*Carr*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.

"A claim is anticipated only if each and every element as set forth in the claim is found, either expressly or inherently described, in a single prior art reference." *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 814 F.2d 628, 631, 2 U.S.P.Q.2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987); MPEP 2131. Additionally, "[t]he identical invention must be shown in as complete detail as is contained in . . . the claim." *Richardson v. Suzuki Motor Co.*, 868 F.2d 1226, 1236, 9 U.S.P.Q.2d 1913, 1920 (Fed. Cir. 1989); MPEP 2131.

Of the rejected claims, Claims 1, 8 and 16 are independent. Independent Claim 1, as amended, recites "a request . . . indicating a desired Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address having at least a first portion," "transforming the request to comprise the at least a first portion and another portion" and "automatically forwarding the request to the desired URL address." Applicant respectfully submits that *Carr* does not disclose or even suggest the limitations of Claim 1. *Carr* appears to disclose utilizing a virtual URL that includes a reference to a virtual computer workgroup and a virtual file name. (*Carr*, Col. 3, Lines 36-38). The virtual URL of *Carr* specifies a method for finding the path to a particular file via the virtual computer workgroup and a virtual file name references. (*Carr* Col. 3, Lines 38-41). In particular, *Carr* appears to disclose utilizing a sequence of instructions to locate the best current source of the file (based on priority and availability of the servers), then replacing the virtual URL with an actual URL that describes the actual location of the file. (*Carr*, Col. 3, Lines 49-53; *see also* Col. 5, Lines 1-16). *Carr* specifically states that "[t]he virtual URL does not specify a specific path to a server file like conventional URL. Instead, the virtual URL specifies a method for finding the path to a particular file." (*Carr* Col. 3, lines 38-41)(emphasis added). Accordingly, *Carr* does not disclose or even suggest "a request . . . indicating a desired Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address" as recited by Claim 1 (emphasis added). Therefore, for at least this reason, Applicant submits that *Carr* does not anticipate independent Claim 1.

Independent Claim 8 recites, at least in part, "a server . . . operable to receive a request over the network from a client enabled to communicate using an Internet communications protocol, the request indicating a desired Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address," and independent Claim 16 recites, at least in part, "application software . . . operable to receive a request from a client enabled to communicate using an Internet communications protocol, the request indicating a desired Uniform Resource Locator (URL) address." For at least the reasons discussed above in connection with independent Claim 1, Applicant submits that *Carr* does not anticipate independent Claims 8 and 16.

Claims 2 and 4-7, 9-11, 14, 15, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 that depend respectively from independent Claims 1 and 8 and 16 are also not anticipated by *Carr* at least because they incorporate the limitations of respective Claims 1, 6 and 18 and also add additional elements that further distinguish *Carr*. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 2, 4-7, 9-11, 14-15, 17, 19, 20, 22 and 23 be withdrawn.

SECTION 103 REJECTIONS

Claims 3, 12, 13, 18 and 21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Carr* as applied to Claims 1, 8 and 16 above, and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,466,966 issued to Kirch et al. (hereinafter "*Kirsch*"). Applicant respectfully traverses this rejection.


Claim 3 depends from independent Claim 1, Claims 12 and 13 depend from independent Claim 8, and Claims 18 and 21 depend from independent Claim 16. For at least the reasons discussed above, Claims 1, 8 and 16 are in condition for allowance. Therefore, for at least this reason, Claims 3, 12, 13, 18 and 21 that depend respectively therefrom are also allowable and, therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection of Claims 3, 12, 13, 18 and 21 be withdrawn.

CONCLUSION

Applicant has made an earnest attempt to place this case in condition for immediate allowance. For the foregoing reasons and for other reasons clearly apparent, Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration and full allowance of all pending claims.

No fee is believed due with this Response. If, however, Applicant has overlooked the need for any fee due with this Response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees or credit any overpayment associated with this Response to Deposit Account No. 08-2025 of Hewlett-Packard Company.

Respectfully submitted,

By: 
James L. Baudino
Reg. No. 43,486

Date: May 5, 2005

Correspondence to:
L.Joy Griebenow
Hewlett-Packard Company
Intellectual Property Administration
P. O. Box 272400
Fort Collins, CO 80527-2400
Tel. 970-898-3884